The Church and the Church College

IN VIEW OF THE RECENT DEVELOPMENT OF THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION

SPENCE LIBRARY
Union Theological Seminary,
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

D.T.R.

Alcove	Case	Shelf
W	B	17

—BY—
REV. W. S. PLUMER BRYAN, D. D.
CHICAGO

TG
4
Zp
Box 1
no. 21
IBR
box 2

The Church and the Church College

Their Mutual Relationship in View of the Recent Development of the Carnegie Foundation

AN ADDRESS BEFORE

The Philadelphia Alumni Association of Lafayette College

Delivered at the Annual Meeting at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel

Philadelphia, Tuesday Evening, March 7, 1912

—BY—

REV. W. S. PLUMER BRYAN, D. D.

Pastor of the Church of the Covenant

CHICAGO

The address is given here in full. Owing to the lateness of the hour and the fact that other speakers were to follow, it was greatly abbreviated in delivery

Press of
Frank B. Jenvey
Cumberland, Maryland
1912

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Alumni Association:

I count it a great honor that I have been invited to meet with you, the Philadelphia Alumni of Lafayette.

My associations with your College carry me back to my boyhood days in Pittsburgh. In the home of my father and in the home of my grandfather, whose name I bear, your College was held in high esteem, largely through the great honor they gave to the names of Dr. Cattell and Dr. March. I felt it not only a privilege but a filial duty on my last visit to Lafayette to pay my respects to Dr. March. His influence, like that of Dr. Cattell, abides, although both of them have passed to the heavenly reward. Your President, Dr. Warfield, to whose address you have listened with such evident appreciation, and whom you justly hold in such high regard, has been for many years my personal friend, whose influence for good I have always noted with great satisfaction.

The occasion this evening suggests the question as to the relation between a Christian College and the Christian Church. From its foundation Lafayette has been a Christian College in vital relation with the Presbyterian Church through the Synod of Pennsylvania. Among its distinguished graduates are not only educators, lawyers, doctors, engineers, captains of industry and financiers, but ministers of the Gospel and missionaries in the distant portions of the globe. Among the graduates who have not entered the ministry, are many who hold office or membership in the Presbyterian Church, and by their character and influence honorably represent the Church. The whole question of the relation between the Church and the College has been reopened and it is evidence of your vital touch with the sentiment of the present day, that you have chosen this as the theme on which you would have me address you.

THE GRADUATES OF LAFAYETTE

The question presents itself to you, I understand, in a very practical and urgent way. You have recognized the fact

that with your present endowment your professorial staff cannot be adequately provided for. Your purpose is to afford to the members of this staff a higher range of salaries that they may do their work freed from the embarrassments which many of our educators feel so keenly to-day. I congratulate you on your penetration of the educational situation in singling out this topic so long neglected. It is certainly a distinction of which your Association may well be proud, that you have taken up this subject seriously. May it be that your action will set the pace for other institutions, which as yet have given no sign of interest in this crying need of the day!

A HIGH DISTINCTION

The tendency in many institutions to provide for grounds and buildings and lawns and athletics to the neglect of the teaching force has resulted in hardships untold, hardships the harder to bear because the sufferer is restrained by his position from making his sufferings known. The laboring man can strike, the labor union can negotiate with the employers when the wage is too low, but the college professor must see hundreds and thousands poured out for the material betterment of the institution, while he and his family struggle in vain to maintain an appearance in keeping with his position. The income which has always been low enough is, in the present day of high prices, barely sufficient for the necessities of life, leaving nothing for those things which make life worth living.

PROFESSORS' SALARIES

The average salary in the great independent colleges of the country is about $2400; in the State institutions, about $2100; in Church institutions, about $1500, while in more than one hundred Church institutions the average salary is less than $1000. That is, the professor and the minister stand on about the same footing. The Government statistics show that the average salary of ministers is $663, in the Presbyterian Church with which we are connected $1177. Compare this salary of $1000 or $1500, with the salaries paid for instance in municipal service for the humbler forms of official duty, with the policemen, firemen, coal passers, engineers, clerks, etc. It will at once appear that the man of education, the man from whose hands the youth of the country are to receive the training that fits them for their places in life, is both overworked and underpaid.

It is therefore a token of a true interest in education that you, the Alumni of Lafayette College, are concerned with the question of a living compensation for your teaching force. The experience through which you have passed of losing one of your

most competent men quite recently to an institution which is able to pay him more adequately is one which every institution must suffer until it is enabled to offer that support which is the due of its professors.

The Veteran Professor

The cause of Education is under deep obligation to Mr. Andrew Carnegie for the force and power with which he has directed attention to this crying need. Mr. Carnegie's gifts to our colleges including Church colleges are royal in their amount, and have stimulated the usefulness of these institutions to a marked degree. After having poured out his money by the millions for individual institutions, money that was spent largely upon buildings that were greatly needed, he conceived the idea of a fund which would provide retiring allowances for veteran professors and pensions for those who had been in service for a period of twenty-five years. He set aside $10,000,000, the income of which was to be used for this purpose, in such a way that it should afford relief to the professor upon reaching the age of retirement, should free the institution from the obligation of providing for its veteran professors, should afford assurances to all professors in such institutions that they will be adequately provided for, and furthermore should afford an opportunity of enforcing certain standards of educational policy.

MR. CARNEGIE'S GIFTS

Serious criticism has been made of this plan. Such criticism as questions the right of the founder to bestow his money and to prescribe the conditions of its distribution is entirely out of place. His Foundation is a private corporation; it bears the name and executes the purpose of its founder, and represents the will of no one but himself. Its sole business is to ascertain and carry out his purpose in the disposal of his gifts. He has as much right to give $10,000,000 to this cause as a poorer man has to give $1000 for a student's scholarship. We may in the future come to the point when the disposal of great fortunes will be regulated by law, but we are not there yet, and for the present at least, it is the height of unwisdom to call in question Mr. Carnegie's right to do what he will with his own.

MR. CARNEGIE'S RIGHTS

This right of Mr. Carnegie's has been exercised by him to exclude from this benefaction every institution in which the

Christian Church of any name has the slightest trace of control.

THE BAN ON THE CHURCH COLLEGE

The terms of his gift make it inexorably incumbent upon his trustees to refuse recognition to institutions which are organically related to the Christian Church, and the various types of this organic relation are clearly set forth in the publications of the Foundation. Earnest efforts have been made to secure a modification of this decision, but in vain. After various approaches with all kinds of influence, it has come to be recognized that the only condition on which an institution organically related to the Christian Church can enjoy the benefits of the Foundation is the absolute severance of the tie which binds it to the Church. To make this clear, the Foundation recites in its publications the steps which it has required institutions to take in order to come within its provisions. In themselves, these steps to the average man seem drastic and severe, and they have been taken only under what has been felt to be the stress of stern necessity. The men in control have felt apparently that they must have the money at any cost, and if the cost has been the sacrifice of historic associations and sacred ties they have felt obliged to pay it.

In all this, let us stoutly maintain that Mr. Carnegie has acted entirely within his civic rights, and that his trustees have only done what the terms of the appointment required them to do. Christian men who believe in the rights of private property should be the last to question a man's right in the disposal of his fortune. Doubtless they may feel that had the money been theirs, they would have disposed of it otherwise. Doubtless they wish from the bottoms of their hearts that Mr. Carnegie had not seen fit to exclude colleges in organic relations with the Church from the benefits of his Foundation. But Christian men who serve the Lord God, to whom belongeth the riches of the earth are not beholden to any one man or group of men for that which they need. The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof. And as in the past He has provided for those who seek Him, so in the future will He not forsake them. Valuable as money is in human life it is not the supreme need of man. Indeed in these days, perhaps the greatest lesson Christian men need to learn is that which the Master taught when He was hungry, and was tempted to make bread out of stones, and said: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God, shall man live."

No, let us not find fault with Mr. Carnegie, or his trustees. They have acted strictly within their rights; they have

offered to give aid to, or rather, to consider the applications for aid of educational institutions. The question before us to-night is not whether they have a right to offer, but whether our institutions can afford to apply to them for aid. Can those who are in charge of our institutions be responsible for the consequences of placing them under the influence of this Foundation? It is only to confuse the issue to shut our eyes to this question. Trustees and especially presidents of our institutions are naturally eager for the money of Mr. Carnegie, but the conditions attached are heavy. Mr. Carnegie's goods come high. The price is plainly marked, and there is no discount. Can we afford to pay the price?

THE REAL QUESTION

Let us cordially admit that the issue was not quite so clear at the outset as it is to-day. A number of institutions paid the price before they understood fully all that it meant. Lafayette College is fortunate in that it has before it the experience of the years which have passed since the operations of the Foundation began. You will doubtless appreciate to the full the advantages which would accrue from a place on this Foundation, but you will weigh well the considerations which suggest that these advantages may be purchased at a price too high.

These considerations are many. They relate to various aspects of college life. They are all of them fit for the attention of an Alumni Association like yours. I assume that, coming as you do from different professions and occupations you are not all particularly concerned with the relation of your College to the Church. It may be that some of you are even indifferent to the distinctively Christian character of your College. Yet the questions involved are so far reaching that every man of public spirit and of genuine interest in the work of the College, finds himself bound to face them.

THE CONCERN OF ALL ALUMNI

The Question of Public Policy

There is a grave question of public policy involved, which demands the attention of the citizen, whether he be interested in education or in the Christian religion or not. Our colleges are set to train the young men who are to shape the future of our country. Increasingly, there is a demand for the man of a broad and general education, for one who is able to handle the questions arising out of our complex social, political and economic situation. Important as are Latin and Greek and Mathe-

matics and the technical sciences, the broader questions involving the public welfare are more important. No student of our public life can fail to note the increasing sensitiveness of the public conscience to the dangers of concentrated wealth. The regulation of our sources of wealth which seemed impossible a decade ago is now recognized as an imperative duty of the State and the Nation. This is finely illustrated in the position taken by the trustees of Brown University, at Providence, R. I., among whom are such eminent men as Mr. Justice Charles E. Hughes, of the United States Supreme Court, and Mr. Henry K. Porter, of Pittsburgh, who is doubtless well known to the business men of Philadelphia. These trustees considered carefully the possibility of putting their institution under the Carnegie Foundation, but after a year's study they came unanimously to the conclusion that to do so would in the public mind expose them to the charge of having acted "from sordid motives," because the public mind was unable "to disentangle the moral from the financial question." As a result and because of certain conditions of their charter they undertook to provide an adequate pension fund of their own. The example set by these men is worthy of our highest admiration. They would protect their institution from the charge of "sordid motives." They would send forth their graduates without the suspicion of having obtained their education through the sacrifice of moral ideals to pecuniary gain. While not every institution is as able as Brown University to provide a pension fund, every one, however poor, is able to maintain the same high standard of moral ideal, even at the cost of material benefits which it would like to enjoy.

BROWN UNIVERSITY "SORDID MOTIVES"

Another recent illustration arises out of the application by a certain distinguished educator now very much in public view who believed that, having served twenty-five years, he was entitled to the service pension at first offered by the Foundation. It seems that that service pension was withdrawn a year or two ago and thus the application of the educator was refused, though he himself had rendered eminent service in carrying out the plans of the Foundation. The incident has awakened particular interest because the educator is considered by many people to be worthy of the high office of the presidency. Various opinions have been expressed concerning the wisdom of the application, but, whatever we may think of it, the result is

THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT AND THE CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENCY

most interesting as showing the popular attitude towards such a concentration of wealth as the Foundation is. The educator referred to apparently is not suffering in the public estimate as a result of the incident, but if we may trust the comments which have been drawn forth by the incident we will be forced to recognize the growing hostility to the control of education by private corporations like this Foundation. This hostility is accentuated by the fact that the application of the educator was made and acted upon a year before it was given to the public, and that its publication took place just at the time that the educator was coming to be thought of for the presidency. The question has been asked over and over, Whether an educational agency of this kind is to be used to hinder the recognition in national politics of individual educators whose views may not agree in all particulars with those of some of the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation? Is the Foundation to be interjected into politics to promote certain private interests or to hinder certain popular movements? If this is so, what are we to think of the claim that the Foundation is established "for the advancement of teaching?" Is such a fund consistent with sound public policy?

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

The most acute illustration of this growing sensitiveness of the public conscience arises out of the Rockefeller Foundation, by which $100,000,000 was set aside for "the good of mankind." A charter was sought from Congress appointing a Board of Trustees to distribute the fund. The charter was refused on the ground of public policy. A self-perpetuating and irresponsible board was judged a danger, or, as President Schurmann, of Cornell, said of the Carnegie Foundation itself: "A real menace to the best interests of higher education." The bill was then amended to provide that the selection of trustees should have the approval of a Board consisting of the President, the Vice-President, the Chief Justice of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the presidents of five universities; that Congress should have the right to limit the objects of the corporation; that its affairs might be wound up at a fixed time, and that the interest should never be added to the principal and allowed to accumulate.* Contrast this with the self-perpetuating character of the charter of the Carnegie Foundation, which has no such safeguards but is a close corporation called into being by one man to carry out his private wishes along

*A month after this address was given, the House of Representatives at Washington refused consideration to the amended bill to establish this foundation. Whether it can pass Congress in any form so far proposed is open to serious question.

certain lines, which, however laudable in themselves, are beyond the regulation of the State, the Church or the modern educational world. Indeed, if we may credit the early claims of the Foundation, it proposes to regulate rather than to be regulated.

THE WELLESLEY FRESHMEN

It is very significant that the Freshmen at Wellesley College a few months ago petitioned the Faculty to return to Mr. Rockefeller a fund of $150,000 presented by him to the College some years before on the ground that "We, the undersigned, do not feel that our College should rest under the shadow of this gift." If this be true of the private gift of Mr. Rockefeller to a single institution, what will our undergraduates soon come to think of the benefactions of the Carnegie Foundation? It begins to appear that our young collegians are becoming restive under the prospect of lifelong obligation to funds like these.

These are questions of public policy. They confront every citizen, educated or uneducated, Christian or agnostic. They apply to institutions which make no claim to Christian connections, to a technical school as well as to a Church College. They demand answer from those in charge of our institutions, an answer prompted not only by an appreciation of Mr. Carnegie's offer, but by a wise foresight as to the effect upon coming generations of the influence of this mass of wealth, at the disposal as it is of a small group of men, subject to all sorts of influences, political, social and financial, and giving account to no authority beyond themselves.

Our Educational Policy

There are several questions of educational policy which are involved. One of them arises out of the magnificent gift of Mr. Carnegie to the Scottish Universities, amounting to $10,000,000, a gift which was made ten years ago to enable the students to meet their college dues and to obtain their education without the severe sacrifices of the typical Scottish student. After these years of experience the result has been disappointing. More students have applied for the aid than it was supposed would apply and fewer of them have shown any disposition to return the money advanced to them. The chairman of the trustees, the Earl of Elgin, has recently expressed his disappointment that a larger proportion of the students had not seen their way clear to avoid being dependent upon the Trust. It is apparent that the trustees fear that the

THE SCOTTISH UNIVERSITIES

gift, magnificent as it is, will have a pauperizing effect, and will diminish the Scottish character of robust independence.

Another question raised by a distinguished educator, well known to many of you, Prof. Cattell, of Columbia University, the son of your Dr. Cattell, deals with the requirement of sixty-five years as the age of retirement. He says that the teachers who have influenced his life most are Prof. March of Lafayette, and Prof. Wundt of Leipzig, the one who ceased teaching after he had passed eighty, while the other was lecturing at the age of seventy-five. Their best days had not passed at the age limit of the Carnegie Foundation. President Angell, of Michigan, at the age of eighty, and President Eliot, of Harvard, at the age of seventy-five, are evidence that a dead line cannot be drawn at sixty-five.

MARCH AND WUNDT

Another question of serious importance is whether this fund under the conditions laid down is a benefit to the veteran professor himself, or to the institution to which he is connected. The trustees of the Carnegie Foundation are presidents of institutions and not professors, and it is only reasonable that they should administer the fund so as to relieve the financial straits of the institution rather than to improve the status of the professors. The question is raised whether an institution which is able through the Carnegie Foundation to offer a pension will undertake to increase very much the salaries of its active professors. It is the judgment of Prof. Cattell that a pension system "will not improve permanently the financial status of the professor."

DOES IT REALLY BENEFIT THE PROFESSOR?

A more serious question arises out of the interference with the internal administration of the institutions which accept these benefits. This interference seems to be inevitable if the Foundation is to carry out the purpose of enforcing certain standards of educational policy, but just how far the interference may go has never been made clear. The State universities have come under this regulative tendency. The University of Illinois has been told it must break an agreement made some time ago with the professors of the medical school, and the State of Ohio has been informed that it must reconstruct its educational policy. This, let us remember, is the edict of a private corporation created by one man and responsible to no one. Surely our educational system will

THE INTERFERENCE WITH COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

become topsy-turvy if even our State institutions organized by State Legislatures, enrolling thousands upon thousands of students and expending millions of dollars annually are to be subject to the regulation of this self-perpetuating board of trustees which administers the gift of Mr. Carnegie.

The Ethics of the Question

Serious ethical questions are involved. For instance, the Carnegie Foundation will not consider the application of an institution which has less than $200,000 productive endowment. The small, struggling college has no chance for recognition. A century ago Princeton, Yale and Harvard would have been ineligible. When, however, an institution has accumulated $200,000 productive endowment, the Carnegie Foundation is ready to assume direction of it, to prescribe its standards and to give a pension to its veteran professors.

$200,000 MINIMUM

In the case of Church institutions, this money has been raised by the tears and the prayers and the self-denial of godly men and women with the purpose of providing a place for the education of their sons and daughters where God and His Son Jesus Christ shall be honored and the sanctities of the Christian life shall be observed. It is true in many cases, as in Lafayette, that the Church, officially, has done very little, but the people who believe in the Church have done everything and have done it because of the relation of the institution to the Church. A trust is created in every Church institution and whatever be the legal questions, there is a serious moral question which must have its effect upon every student whether it is right to divert from the Christian Church the control of funds raised in her name. The head master of a high school in Connecticut very properly asked:

"What will these boys say (and they are a pretty keen lot), as they discuss the ethical principles involved in a college renouncing its allegiance? Will they not sometimes recall the story of the young man who sold his birthright? Is the cause of teaching advanced when colleges, once strongholds of higher education, are tempted to forsake the faith that has made them what they are?"

THE HIGH SCHOOL BOYS

This ethical question is the more startling if the calculation of the Foundation itself is correct, which is that a college with a faculty of twenty professors at an average salary of $2500 would have an annual pay roll of $50,000 and would expend

$2500 in maintaining its retiring allowance system. The sum of $2500 is estimated as sufficient in a college of twenty professors to provide for the demands of a retiring allowance. This represents a fund of $50,000 or $60,000, which is no more than the cost of many a college building, and for this the colleges are asked to come under the control of the Foundation. That is, for the return on an average investment of $60,000, the college surrenders its control of $200,000 and upwards. If this be poor ethics, it is worse economics. That this surrender is real, that it is enforced remorselessly, is a matter of history, as the narratives of the Foundation itself plainly show. Those narratives are a triumphant display of the power of money in the hands of the Carnegie Foundation, but they constitute a painful and humiliating chapter in the history of modern education, a chapter which, in years to come, those who have contributed to it will be willing to give their all if only they could wipe it out.

Yes, the money of the Carnegie Foundation has its price. As business men, you dare not shut your eyes to this price. As Alumni of Lafayette you will carefully consider whether any dole from the Carnegie Foundation is worth to you the sacrifice of the historic associations and the sacred relationships which cluster around the name of Lafayette.

The Religious Significance of the Change

The last question before us this evening is not by any means the least in importance. I am sure that a large number of you here tonight, whatever your occupations may be, are not willing to sacrifice the Church connection or the Christian character of your Alma Mater.

It may seem a small thing to break the tie which binds the college to the Synod of Pennsylvania, especially as the tie has not been productive in itself of great material results.

FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES

It may seem only a formal thing to apply for the recognition of the Carnegie Foundation, especially as the resultant benefits in dollars and cents are so great. As a fact, however, it is a change involving fundamental issues. Lafayette was founded as a Christian institution in vital connection with the Presbyterian Church; Lafayette under the Carnegie Foundation will lose all connection with the Presbyterian Church. Its trustees and faculty will doubtless continue to be largely Presbyterian, although they dare not be exclusively so if they are to enjoy the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation; but the Presbyterian

Church as such is utterly powerless to influence the future course of the college. Whatever the character of the teacher or the teaching, the hands of the Church are tied after a college comes under the Carnegie Foundation. She has no more influence than she has over the University of Pennsylvania. The control which once she had has passed from her hands into this new body, which has the power of money behind it, and which does not hesitate to punish any institution that disregards its wishes.

The change of corporate relation, however, might not be so serious if the Foundation were composed of men in sympathy with the Christian faith. If it were, the relationship might be cordial and co-operative even if it were not vital and organic. Many such relationships exist. That a number of the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation are Christian men, some of them ministers of the Gospel, no one will deny. Neither can anyone deny that it will be difficult to bring others of them under even the broadest definition of Christianity or of religion itself. To name no other than the President of the Foundation, Dr. Pritchett, who is also its chief executive officer, we learn that he was educated first in a Methodist College in Missouri, and that he is a man of large information and great ability. It is claimed that his attitude towards the Christian institutions which have come under his supervision is kindly and considerate. Yet his own views on Religion are so plainly set forth that there is no room for doubt as to what he believes. In his book, "What is Religion?" he has published a number of addresses made before the student body of an institution with which he was connected before he came to his present position. This volume has been published for some time and, so far as I know, nothing has come from Dr. Pritchett to retract any of the views therein expressed. It is to be taken, therefore, as a serious forthsetting of his opinions on the fundamental verities of religion.

DR. PRITCHETT

It is not possible to do more than indicate briefly what his views are. It must suffice to say that his purpose is to expound what he calls "The scientific conception of Religion and of God." This conception he teaches us has the following marks: First, it is "inconsistent with the idea of a divine, omnipotent person, interfering directly in the affairs of our lives and of our world." Second, "No instance of such interference has ever been known"; Third, serious men "must pray not perhaps for material help, not in expectation that the laws

of the universe shall be changed at their request, nor even primarily for strength to live rightly and justly, but as the supreme effort of the human soul to know God." If these quotations raise questions in your minds, please verify them and consult the context. They are I think sufficient to indicate that, in the view of Dr. Pritchett, there is no God who comes personally to the relief and the succour of us lost men aside from what we may expect from the ordinary laws of nature. No such thing as a miracle has ever been known, and that means that such an one as Jesus, the Son of God, born of the Virgin and risen from the dead, did not appear upon earth for our salvation. Prayer is not to be offered in the expectation of bringing anything to us but only as an expression of our personal attitude.

NO DIVINE INTERVENTION
NO MIRACLE
NO ANSWER TO PRAYER

Now what will be the influence in our Christian institutions where prayer is daily offered, where God's Word is studied and Jesus Christ is worshipped and souls are urged to dedicate themselves to Him, when a man holding these views is recognized as the President of the Foundation which has taken the institution under its supervision and direction? When an issue arises, for instance, between a professor holding these views and a board of trustees opposing these views, where will the strong hand of Dr. Pritchett be felt? Surely it is difficult enough to maintain the Christian atmosphere in our educational institutions without tying them hand and foot under the teachings of a man whose views are not only anti-Christian and anti-theistic, but, in every recognized sense of the word, anti-religious.

TIED HAND AND FOOT

Let us accord to Dr. Pritchett all freedom of opinion, as we have already accorded to Mr. Carnegie his right to bestow his wealth as he will. Indeed, Dr. Pritchett deserves our thanks for setting out his beliefs about religion so baldly and so boldly. We have no grievance against him. Our responsibility begins when we consider proposals to Christian institutions under his supervision. What must be the mind of men who deliberately open their institutions to this influence? If the youth of our Christian institutions become blinded as to God and His Son, Jesus Christ, if they are swept off into the dark seas of doubt and despair, the fault will lie at the doors of the Christian men who have consented to this deed.

DOUBT AND DESPAIR

The Summons to the Church

The summons to the Church sounds loud and clear. Mr. Carnegie has placed her under obligations by pointing out the sore needs of her teaching force. For this we owe him a debt of gratitude though we dare not accept his measures of relief. The Church, which founded these institutions and nurtured them, must maintain them. For the moment, the Church seems to have relaxed her purpose. Absorbed in other duties she has failed to make adequate provision for her colleges and academies. Let us believe that it is for the moment only, let us labor that her sons and her daughters whom God has blessed with wealth may rise up and dedicate of their possessions to the sacred cause of Education. The question of method is one of detail. The claims upon the Church are many. The duty of the individual, however, stands out clear and distinct.

Men of Lafayette! lead the way. Provide sufficiently for the faithful men who are teaching in your class-rooms, who feel the stress of the times far more than you do, men who are not accustomed to the elegant and sumptuous surroundings of this banquet, men who make one dollar do what ten dollars does for you, men who are doing a work that will tell in ages to come in the quiet of the class-room and in their personal influence upon your student body.

Men of Lafayette! lead the way, and all over this land Christian colleges will follow your lead, and generations to come, both of educators and of students, will rise up and call you blessed.

Education and Religion